JPRS 78547

20 July 1981

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1900

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS 78547

20 July 1981

EAST EUROPE REPORT

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1900

CONTENTS

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Briefs
Regional Committee Cadres 1

HUNGARY

Party Weighs Approaches to Intellectual Ferment Triggered by Bibo Memorial
(Hans-Henning Paetzke; FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, 26 Jun 81)..... 2

POLAND

Theoretical Aspects of Foreign Policy Reviewed
(Artur Bodnar, Waldemar J. Szczepanski; SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, Jan 81)..... 6

ROMANIA

Roundtable on Revolutionary Humanism, Human Rights
(ERA SOCIALISTA, 5, 20 Apr 81)..... 22

Members of Executive Bureau of National Council of Workers
(SCINTEIA TINERETULUI, 27 Jun 81)..... 36

BRIEFS

REGIONAL COMMITTEE CADRES--At its 19 June session in Ceske Budejovice, attended by CPCZ Central Committee Secretary Mikulas Beno, the CPCZ's South Bohemian Regional Committee discussed, among other things, also certain cadre matters. It unanimously elected Miroslav Slavik leading secretary of the party's regional committee; and Miloslav Senkyr secretary of the committee. Before their election, the former was secretary of the CPCZ's Regional Committee; and the latter leading secretary of the CPCZ's district committee in Ceske Budejovice. [Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 20 Jun 81 p 1] Constituent sessions of regional national committees were held on 22 June in the CSSR. In Kladno, the session of the Central Bohemian Committee reelected Jiri Burian committee chairman; in Plzen, the session of the West Bohemian Committee reelected Miroslav Novotny committee chairman; in Hradec Kralove, the session of the East Bohemian Committee elected Vladimir Bursa committee chairman; in Bratislava, the session of the West Slovak Committee reelected Jan Kralik committee chairman; and in Banska Bystrica, the session of the Central Slovak Committee elected Jan Pikula committee chairman. [Prague PRACE in Czech 23 Jun 81 p 3]

CSO: 2400/252

PARTY WEIGHS APPROACHES TO INTELLECTUAL FERMENT TRIGGERED BY BIBO MEMORIAL

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 26 Jun 81 p 10

[Article by Hans-Henning Paetzke: "'Strictly Confidential: These Authors Are Calling the Road of Hungary in Question!'--From an Internal Budapest Party Assessment--Effects From Poland on Hungarian Intellectuals?"]

[Text] An assessment of quite a special kind is circulating among Hungarian intellectuals. It has been written by the Department for Science, Education and Culture of the Central Committee for the Propaganda and Agitation Committee, having been commissioned by the Politburo in a session on 9 December 1980. An extract signed by hand with the note "strictly confidential" has reached the public. (Evidently the abridgment was to make it easier for the offices concerned to read the paper.) Whether this was an operational breakdown or an intended leak is not yet known, and perhaps will never be known for sure.

How did the assessment come into being? In addition to the official state culture, there has been an unofficial culture in Hungary for some years. To be noted here among other things is a Samizdat literature taking its orientation from Poland, which however has not attained any significance so far. On 21 May 1979 it apparently entered a new phase of development. On that day something must have happened in the heads of the Hungarian intelligentsia. At the grave of a man ignored for more than 20 years, a confusing assembly of mourners had gathered--representatives of the official state culture, intellectuals on the fringe, officers of the security service. The two eulogies took stands which on the one hand were tolerated officially and on the other hand were fought by the state. Over the grave of Istvan Bibo, Gyula Illyes, born in 1902, and Janos Kenedi shook hands--the former a writer who had received high decorations from the state, the latter the best known organizer of the unofficial cultural and political scene. Istvan Bibo had been minister of state in the 1956 revolutionary government. He did significant work as a political scientist and historian. Gyorgy Konrad, who read Bibo's most important writings already in the early fifties, considers him perhaps the greatest Hungarian thinker of this century. In an essay which is a piece of genius, Bibo had discussed the German question as early as 1942. Entitled "The German hysteria, Its History and Causes," it is an important contribution to the theory of fascism which so far has been available only in manuscript form.

After the 1956 revolution, Bibo was sentenced to life imprisonment. In 1963 he was freed in an amnesty. He led a secluded life until his death as a librarian, just as he had done between 1948 and 1956. After the war, until the communists assumed power, he had occupied a position of political responsibility and was regarded as the main ideologist of the Peasants Party. His seclusion in the Stalinist and post-Stalinist era must not be equated with political and intellectual lethargy, however. In the meantime a considerable life's work came into being. To a very small extent, he was able to publish in Hungarian journals in the seventies, but publishing houses remained closed to him. Since 1968 a generation of young intellectuals has grown up in Hungary which became increasingly interested in Bibo's work. The great wear and tear of Marxist ideology contributed to the fact that Bibo, the moralizing political scientist, historian and non-Marxist was able to meet with increasing interest among a Marxist-trained intelligentsia. Then at Bibo's graveside, the time had come. Here the idea was born of publishing a Bibo memorial tome with the participation of the broadest possible stratum of Hungarian intellectual life. Even before the first line of this study volume had been written, violent discussions arose both among intellectuals and among party officials.

Among the former it was a question of deciding who was to be excluded from participating in the volume for qualitative and ideological reasons; among the latter it was a question of whether the volume was to be sacrificed to censorship in its entirety or in part.

Ferenc Donath, one of the leaders of the illegal Communist Party between the two world wars and a friend of Istvan Bibo's to the end, took over the chairmanship of a 10-member editorial committee. Some papers were returned to their authors as being too radical.

In the fall of 1980 a Bibo manuscript to which 76 authors had contributed was submitted to a Budapest publishing house. Almost anyone who was anybody, from Gyula Illyes to Gyorgy Konrad, had made a contribution to the volume comprising [1,000] pages. Thus the Bibo memorial tome became the expression of a sort of popular front, and this alarmed the party, which preceeded to try to break up that front.

After the editorial committee refused to do without five authors, the manuscript was promptly rejected. But independently from the customary publisher's reader's opinion, the above-mentioned report, commissioned by the Politburo on 9 December 1980, was written in the meantime. The report starts out as follows:

"At a previous time a report has already been written for the Politburo about the activity of hostile, oppositionist and pseudo-oppositionist groups, about tasks connected with this and about the existence of the Bibo memorial volume....The respect for the person and work of Bibo is only a pretense for being able to express oneself politically. In fact, it is a successful occasion, for, unaware of the intentions of the authors and editors, persons participated who value Bibo's heritage and regard a critical processing of Bibo's work as necessary....The submission of the manuscript to the Gondolat publishing house evidently was a provocative step; Ferenc Donath told its director that the manuscript was already in Western hands. The authors consider Bibo's attitude exemplary. While the evaluation of his writings varies, all are agreed that, the actual defeat notwithstanding, the attitude and way of thinking represented by Bibo should be considered a moral historical victory....To a varying extent and for varying reasons, individual authors consider Bibo's ideas acceptable.

"First group: The relationship to Bibo cannot be classified from an analytical point of view. It may be ignored, or it does not exist. To this group belong Aladar Komlos, Sandor Erdei, Sandor Weores, Andras Fodor, Fazekas, Pal Racz, Bertalan Andrasfalvy, E. Valyi-Nagy, Gyula Illyes.

"Second group: A measured scholarly approach. The following may be considered part of this group: Lajos Nemeth, Matyas Csuros, Laszlo Beke, Jano Szucs, Erik Fugedi, Gyorgy Granasztoi, Ambrus Oltvanyi, Lajos Kantor (who lives in Cluj, Romania). Scientific Marxist analysis: Emil Niederhauser. The relationship of these authors to Bibo is not objectionable per se.

"Third group: Mystification of Bibo. To this group belong the following: Piroska Szanto, Gyorgy Dalos, Istvan Vas, Verenc Merei, Arpad Goncz, Laszlo Hegedus, Sandor Bali, Perjes, Sandor Csoori, Geza Kepes, Joszef Tornai, Miklos Domokos and Janos Szasz of Bucharest. Aliz Halda and Marvanyi in restrospect deny their relationship to socialism with their own course of life.

"Fourth group: Openly oppositionist authors. Among them many criticize Bibo from the right for having entertained illusions vis-a-vis the Communist Party. For names, see below.

"Fourth group: Some authors of the volume take a stand on questions of the relationship...on the political power. Constructive attitude: Gyula Kodolanyi. Yearning for an autonomous status in thinking: Gyorgy Granasztol. Hostile course of confrontation, filled with hate: Gyorgy Konrad....Citing Istvan Bibo's teachings from his life's course, they call in question the whole historical road traversed by our society since 1945. The most important theses are the following: The socialist system in Hungary, and also in other central European countries, was illegitimate. It had lost its legality in the year of the upheaval in that under the protection of Soviet bayonets a coup had taken place with the smashing of democratic attempts, with a minority seizing power by force. The totalitarian state which was created...is compared by some authors to fascist systems....For the sake of power, party and state leadership had sold national independence.... Istvan Eorsi poses the question as to whether Georg Lukas was an 'accessory' to this devious strategy or an 'ingenuous victim' of it....

"The oppositionist authors of the volume rehabilitate 1956 as a revolution....In their opinion, an attempt was made in 1956 to reestablish the status quo before 1948, to restore the democratic institutions and the multiparty system....This democratic revolutionary attempt had been drowned in blood by the Soviet troops. The Kadar government had been the result of their intervention....The aim: Pluralism, a multiparty system....Qualitatively new features in the Bibo memorial tome....The authors also include persons who heretofore have moved within the framework of realities....

"A phenomenon that should be stressed particularly is the collective presence of the authors guard which played an active role in the 1956 counterrevolution-- Sandor Bali, Ferenc Donah, Joszef Gali, Arpad Goncz, L. Hegedus, Ferenc Merei. Four authors are not Hungarian citizens. Compared with former actions, a broad closing of ranks has occurred here....

"Theoretical writings have appeared previously. Czechoslovak solidarity, signature-collecting actions. Now domestic political questions are subjected to direct analysis....Evaluation of developments in the Soviet Union....Evaluation of the 1956 revolution, evaluation of relations with the Soviet Union. Poland renders these questions even more topical for them. They are radicalized by the past tactical successes of the Polish opposition....The prerequisites of a Samizdat edition of the Bibo memorial tome have already been insured. Ferenc Donath's statement that the manuscript is in Western hands has also been confirmed by the Ministry of the Interior....Whatever Bibo material is usable must be picked out. In the Magveto publishing house, a Bibo anthology and a volume of essays has been issued. This is an opportunity to take a more offensive ideological stand against the memorial volume being issued illegally in the West.

"One has to talk with the nonoppositionist authors, whose separation appears possible. Miklos Tamas and Pal Rez are working at a place where they can make their views prevail through their activity in an undesirable manner: Assign them to a different area of work! Aliz Halda: The same! One must check as to whether there are not any more such cases. Bertalan and Bojtar shall dissociate themselves; if not, party proceedings!"

Signature (typed): Mihaly Kornidesz, head of the Department for Science, Education and Culture attached to the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party. Handwritten signature: Andrea Knopp, employee of the department.

"Assign to a different area of work!" In clear language, that means to give notice. In the past few years this has become a popular practice in Hungary vis-a-vis disagreeable intellectuals.

One thing is sure: the Bibo renaissance which has gone on these past 2 years is a symptom of a definite ailing of the front of ideological unity of socialist Hungary. With the Bibo memorial volume, a fraternization of the intelligentsia has taken place. The politically aware intelligentsia is no longer willing to accept without criticism the absolute power monopoly of the party and of the Soviet Union as a power of occupation. The writer of the assessment rightly senses that, measures by the standards of the current action, the collection of signatures on 29 October 1979 for the Charter 77 persecuted persons was harmless. To the internal chagrin of the party, sociological analyses conducted in recent times have shown that despite all the apparent prosperity there is a great deal of poverty in Hungary. Since then a fund for supporting the poor has been established on a private basis. Artists and writers are organizing benefits. In othe words, Hungarian intellectuals have become active since Bibo's death. Should one talk of a failure of the pseudo-liberal cultural and economic policy?

8790
CSO: 8020/1369

THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF FOREIGN POLICY REVIEWED

Warsaw SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE in Polish No 1, Jan 81 pp 101-116

[Article by Artur Bodnar and Waldemar J. Szczepanski]

[Text] The world in which we live is an interdependent whole. This whole is comprised of a hundred-some sovereign states, constituting the basic units of contemporary international relations.[1] This dependency network is created also by other, nonstate units of political activity in international relations, such as: international organizations--governmental and nongovernmental; political, religious and social movements; political parties; regional communities; ethnic and nationality groups; classes and other large social groups; and also, in specific cases, individuals. Thus the network of mutual relationships and dependencies of countries comprising the global whole is very extensive.

The State's Relationships and Dependencies

The relationships and dependencies in this global whole are further complicated by the fact that the contemporary world is divided into socialism and capitalism, which simultaneously coexist and compete with each other. The relations of both groups of states are based on the primary principle of peaceful coexistence, which originally pertained to relations between political states with different social systems, but which now, under the influence of different international compulsions, applies also to political relations within the sphere of both social structural systems.

Each state, in the totality of these relationships and dependencies, has its own position, which is shaped under the influence of various factors: political and military, economic potential, demographic, natural resources, etc. These dissimilarities in the position of each state in the international relations' network are borne out in the role that the individual states play in the structure of these relations. One of the characteristics of this structure is its ranking by the factor of interests and values and by the factor of space (global level, supraregional level, regional, or bilateral level).[2]

---

[1] R. Bierzanek: "Wspolczesne stosunki miedzynarodowe" [Contemporary International Relations]. Warsaw, 1973, p 105; J. Stefanowicz: "Stary, nowy swiat. Ciaglosc i zmiana w stosunkach miedzynarodowych" [The Old and New World. Continuity and Change in International Relations]. Warsaw, 1978, pp 8-20.

[2] A. Bodnar and W. J. Szczepanski: "Factors in the Evolution of Contemporary International Relations," SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, 1979, No 12, p 124.

The high level of relationships and dependencies between contemporary world states means that each of the below-cited statements is valid and that they are mutually complementary:

a) Poland's foreign and domestic policies are inseparably linked and both are subordinated to the same national needs and reasons, among which the primary reason is to guarantee the continued successful, peaceful development of our country and our nation.[3]

b) The world in which we live is interconnected. Crises of a regional or supra-regional scope jolt international relations in their global dimension. In this situation, states undertake foreign policy action which, in their vital interests, should strive not only to settle regional conflicts that are occurring, but also to prevent the occurrence of new and similar conflicts.[4]

It may be said that the first statement has as its basis the criterion of national needs and reasons, and the second, the criterion of peace. These, in any case, have various empirical connotations (e.g., a balance in the interests of international relations units, or a regard for principles of justice in relations between various ethnic communities, or renunciation of expansionism in international relations as a method of resolving problems of domestic policy). In searching for existential[5] relationships between both criteria (factors) in the shaping of foreign policy, it may be said that the factors cited: national reasons and the peace factor, are among the important factors in a state's foreign policy, but are not equivalent. The factor of national reason is bound up with the state as a unit of international relations; the factor of peace, however, is a characteristic of the specific condition of relations between states--units of international activities. Under specific conditions, national reasons and reasons of peace can be interpreted as being concurrent. The experience of Polish foreign policy confirms the correctness of this. It may also be that reasons of peace will be the development and particularization of national reasons. Finally, under precisely defined conditions, e.g., a threat of total atomic destruction, the reasons of peace take precedence over national reasons. In all these cases what is important is the different syndrome of conditions which shape the relations between national reasons and reasons of peace.

Even a cursory examination of the relationsbetween national reasons and reasons of peace reveals that the basic element of these relations is the state and its interest, which is revealed in the activities of the state towards the international environment. That is why a state's foreign policy must be most broadly understood as being the state's activities in relation to its international environment. The term "state's foreign policy" refers to its activities as a whole in relation to this environment, activities that are aimed at creating favorable (optimal) conditions for fulfilling the interests of a large social group (the nation) whose global organization is the state. Every policy unit undertakes, in relation to other social (political) units, activities determined by specific interests, whose external forms

---

[3] TRYBUNA LUDU, June 25, 1980.

[4] Leonid Brzhnev's speech, PRAVDA, May 8, 1980.

[5] L. Nowak: "Wstep do idealizacyjnej teorii nauki" [Introduction to Idealizational Scientific Theory], Warsaw, 1977, p 105.

are the goals of these activities or their desired results. This statement pertains also to the state as a sovereign unit of policy in international relations.[6]

As the nation's (society's) global organization, the state is functional in relation to the interests of various social units appearing within the framework of this organization, and above all, in relation to the interests of the politically ruling class. Therefore, the state's activities on the outside are conditioned by the interests of different units of the state's political system. These interests, taken as a whole, have a complex, hierarchical, time-variable structure.[7]

The state's foreign policy may be examined in two ways,[8] applying:

a) /a passivist interpretation/ [in boldface]; in this interpretation, the state's foreign policy, understood to be a system of goals and means, is a function of the condition of the international environment, which for this policy is an independent variable. In applying a passivist interpretation to the foreign policy of a given state, we may be dealing with two situations. The first situation occurs when the effect of the so-called independent variable of foreign policy is of the nature of a compulsory situation for the given state (due to allied commitments, effective external pressures, etc.). Foreign policy is then the result of the effects of many external independent variables, whereas the object of these effects is the given state directly, which as a result of its preconditions has no choice but to yield to external compulsions. The second situation occurs when the state's foreign policy, as the result of external circumstances arising in an international environment, finds a favorable internal ground ensuing from the historical experience of a given country or from its general political strategy in relation to the international environment;

b) /an activist interpretation, which has a unitary character/ [in boldface]; the state's foreign policy here is primarily a function of its own needs, revealed by different units of the state's political system and formulated on the state level in a specified order of value, which establishes the relation of preferences examined in terms of national interest.

The interpretations of foreign policy cited above are primarily an analytical step, for on the whole there are no "pure" models for a situation in this field.

Just as every problem political situation, so also the problem situation in foreign policy brings the decisionmaker face to face with several elementary dilemmas, which may include the following questions: the order of importance of activities that can be undertaken on the international arena, the scope of optimization of goals, and the feasibility of maneuver, employing the internal factor and the external factor in state policy. The decisionmaker is thus as a rule preconditioned

---

[6] A. Bodnar: "The External Function of the State and Foreign Policy Goals" in "Teoretyczne problemy polityki zagranicznej" [Theoretical Problems of Foreign Policy], J. E. Palyg and J. Symonides, Editors. Warsaw, 1978, pp 66-70.

[7] K. Jasiewicz: "Articulation of Interests in the Polish Political System. A Modeling Formulation Experiment." STUDIA NAUK POLITYCZNYCH, 1977, No 4, pp 106-124.

[8] For more on this subject, see W. J. Szczepanski: "Research on People's Poland's Foreign Policy." STUDIA NAUK POLITYCZNYCH, 1980, No 1, pp 45-72.

by four circumstances: the state of intra-country affairs; the state of the international environment, or, speaking concretely, the type of balance or imbalance occurring in this environment, and the role which a given country plays in the process of the formulation of this balance or imbalance; the scope of the ranking system in international relations; and finally, the potential for action on the individual levels of the ranked structure of the international relations system.

The Order of Importance of Possible Activities

At the base of this order in foreign policy lie the state's needs and interests. Two basic types of needs stand out: the needs for existence and the needs for development.[9] The needs for existence are the needs connected with the existence of a state-organized nation (society), and thus with the security of the nation and its state. The fulfillment of these needs is served by all kinds of state activity on the international arena, both in the sphere of policy (e.g., alliances), economics (e.g., treaties and agreements), culture, as well as in the military sphere.

The needs for existence and security, as understood from the activist viewpoint, are connected with the need for presence on the international arena. This need is expressed by all efforts to obtain, maintain and expand the political subjectivity of the nation-state and to participate in important international decisionmaking. For example, recently we observed the actions of France and the FRG aimed at increasing their influence on all-European affairs, including the weakening the United States' political position in Europe.[10] A great deal of activity, hitherto unheard-of, has also been demonstrated by small countries (Austria, Switzerland, Finland) in connection with the conference in Madrid, in the direction--if it can be so described--of greater Europeanization of CSCE results.

The next group of needs are the needs of development, most often identified with a growth in the importance and authority of a given state in international relations.

If there is stability and relative balance in international relations, the above-mentioned types of needs appear jointly, and the needs for presence and development in the system of nations and states advance to the forefront. It is worth noting here that the needs for presence and development are fulfilled in the system of states as well as in the system of nongovernmental international relations, which in their general form are, on the whole, promoted by states (e.g., cultural, scientific, technical and economic relations). It can simply be said that the scope and qualitative state of the fulfillment of presence and development needs, depends, in the final analysis, on the scope and qualitative state of the nongovernmental international relations.

That is precisely why the order of importance of activities that can be undertaken in foreign policy is determined by the concrete historical structure of the above-stated needs. This statement can be verified on the basis of an analysis of Polish foreign policy during the past 36 years of People's Poland. By dividing into stages

---

[9] Another, expanded typology of needs in international relations was presented by J. Kukulka: "Problemy teorii stosunkow miedzynarodowych" [Problems in International Relations Theory]. Warsaw, 1978, pp 258-264.

[10] INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, July 12-13, 1980. Also see M. Brzezowski: "Erosion of American Leadership". TRYBUNA LUDU, July 23, 1980.

the manifestation of the principle determinants of our foreign policy decisions, we are able to isolate three main periods: 1944-1949, 1950-1970 and 1970-1980.[11]

1. During 1944-1949, the creation of favorable conditions for the existence of a state-organized nation under new structural and geopolitical conditions, was the dominant, primary goal in Poland's activities in relation to the outside world. This was linked principally with the diplomatic struggle for Poland's place on the political map of Europe and for recognition of our legitimate international subjectivity. Along with these efforts are others, aimed at creating favorable conditions for the nation's security by establishing good relations with the Soviet Union--Poland's most important neighbor--and through efforts to renew traditional political and economic ties with other European states. This is linked also with the first attempts to demonstrate our presence in the world and our participation in solving important international problems. These needs, however, are replaced by needs aimed at ensuring favorable conditions for the nation's existence under new structural and geopolitical conditions.

2. During 1950-1970, despite the steady evolution of international relations, the principle goal of our activities remained the safeguarding of the country's security in relation to the outside world. Thus the efforts undertaken on the international arena were directed mainly at consolidating and developing lasting political and military alliances, and lasting structures of economic, cultural and scientific-engineering cooperation abroad. This comes down to a struggle in support of the recognition by all partners of the territorial status quo in Europe and to the creation on this basis, of bases for normalizing relations with all states. The focus of these efforts is, on the one hand, the Warsaw Pact and our activities in it, and on the other hand, the so-called German problem.

3. During the 1970's, in the structure of needs determining our goals and activities in foreign policy, for the first time the needs associated with Poland's presence in international relations and the growth (development) of our participation in the shaping of these relations, began to dominate. Of course, those activities which serve to safeguard the security of European nations and their peaceful cooperation, are of particular importance. This is due to the finalization of the Polish proposition pertaining to European order, submitted by Poland as far back as 1964 at the Nineteenth Session of the UN General Assembly by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, A. Rapacki.[12] Ten years later, through the collective efforts of 33 European countries and the United States and Canada, the CSCE Final Act was prepared and signed in Helsinki. In the second half of the 1970's, our international activities were subordinated in the same measure to such needs as presence and development (Poland's growing importance in international relations), and the fulfillment of national security needs.

The division into stages cited above is only an attempt to verify the criteria, on the basis of which the turning points in foreign policy development can be isolated.[13] The political history of these periods abounds with various events,

---

[11] W. J. Szczepanski: op.cit., pp 69-70.

[12] COLLECTION OF DOCUMENTS, 1964, No 11-12, p 1564.

[13] Another division into periods was proposed by E. Gajda: "Polska polityka zagraniczna 1944-1974" [Poland's Foreign Policy, 1944-1974]. Warsaw, 1974.

including those of such real significance in expanding Poland's role on the international arena as the 1956 transformations, and also including a series of phenomena which shape the course of global international relations, including European. In the realm of the latter, Poland strived to be a particularly active participant, abiding by all of the political, military and economic preconditions for the coexistence of European states.

The Scope of the Optimization of Goals

The analysis of the optimization of goals in the state's foreign policy is inseparably linked with three other concepts: sovereignty, interdependence, and dependency of a given unit of foreign policy on other units from its international environment. Political history, particularly that of the second half of the 20th century, shows that the process by which many nations, remaining until recently under the colonial dependency system, formally and legally achieved or were granted state sovereignty, has basically come to an end. The completion of this process at the same time demonstrated the vast scale and intensity of interdependencies appearing in international relations.

Interdependence in international relations is today an objective state; it is their attribute.[14] The sources of this state are:

1) the global nature of contemporary international relations due to their technological and social preconditioning;

2) the origination of several mutually overlapping levels of contemporary international relations;

3) the appearance of a military (nuclear) threat to the existence of the human species. This is a factor that did not appear in the history of international relations until the mid-20th century. The nuclear threat gave the needs of existence and security a new dimension which extended beyong the national framework;

4) the threat to the ecology, as a new phenomenon in international relations, caused by technical inefficiency, lack of financial means for more rapid formation of ecologically sterile techniques and technology, and also a group egoism (e.g., international firms) or the ill will of administrators of complex technical systems, e.g., in bordering regions or on international terrain (oceans, cosmic space);

5) a situation in which the world find itself on the brink of the depletion of raw materials and energy sources, which makes it necessary for states to cooperate in solving various current problems, and also in implementing large research programs associated with the potential of exploiting deposits at the bottom of oceans, space utilization, etc.;

6) the world's technological unity, based on the fact that in the industrially developed countries of the East and West, North and South, this same type of creative

---

[14] Some very interesting material on this subject was presented during the international colloqium organized by the de Gaulle Institute in Paris in November 1975, which was dedicated to the conditions for national independence in the contemporary world. See "Les conditions de l'independance nationale dans le monde moderne". Paris, 1975.

force dominates; this force is the organic basis of the international division of labor, the diffusion of production techniques and the economic interdependence of countries, technical standardization, quality standards, etc.;

7) a group of economic factors, such as the world currency-credit market, a price system on the main world commodity markets, etc., which were eroded after the so-called energy-raw materials crisis of 1974-1974.[15] The results of the turbulence of those years affected the economies of all of the world's countries.

Interdependence as an objective states and as an attribute of contemporary international relations relates to all units of these relations, both state and nongovernment, both small states as well as superpowers. Thus it is an independent variable for international relations units, designating the conditions for the interpretation of the sovereignty concept. This interdependence is not the indirect element of the linear dependency between state sovereignty and dependence in international relations. It is the result of the union of many independent and dependent variables. As a result, an interdependence that is correctly comprehended and shaped, i.e., in accordance with a well-conceived national interest, consolidates a state's sovereignty.

A correctly shaped international interdependence lessens the danger that the state will find itself unilaterally dependent on another state. In summary, it may be said that the state's interdependence of the international environment is neither a denial of sovereignty or a confirmation of existing dependencies. A state's interdependence designates the limits of its sovereignty and does not forejudge the existence of dependency. State sovereignty, therefore, is the ability to independently satisfy its internal needs through external activity, undertaken under conditions of international interdependence.

Certain types of international interdependence have, however, an explicit character, for they ensue from binding politico-military alliances based on the principle of strategic balance. On the whole, it can be said that in relation to a certain type of decision in the foreign policy of states of this area, the phenomenon of "collective sovereignty", and not unit (state) sovereignty, comes into play. Furthermore, Europe, for example, is beginning to form supranational bodies, whose characteristic is also the phenomenon of "collective sovereignty." This phenomenon, however, cannot remain in flagrant contradiction with the national interests of individual units of "collective sovereignty," for it threatens the collapse of political balance in the international environment through sudden process of disintegration in this environment.

The above remarks on the category of interdependence in international relations in their contemporary form, permit us to return to the previously cited seven factors (sources) that form the substance of this category in its concretely historical form. The cited factors of interdependence are not equivalent. Some of them are political and military factors, while other are engineering, technological and economic factors. These factors have an influence on individual units of international relations as well as on the specific levels of collectivity of international

---

[15] M. Wirowski: "The International Energy Crisis," SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, 1974, No 3.

relations units. Their effect on these levels is of an asymmetric nature in view of: a) the differentiated force of their action on the specific units and specific levels; b) the varied ability of the national (state) interest to make itself known, depending on the locations of the states in the context of the hierarchical levels of contemporary international relations.

The hierarchical levels of these relations developed gradually since the mid-1950's. They first appeared alongside two opposing world structural systems--socialist and capitalist. That is why world international relations and their structures were, in practice, dominated by the conflicts of two opposing structural camps. As international political detente progressed, primarily along the USSR-United States line, the decolonization of "third world" countries, the appearance of various threats to the existing international order and world peace--both world structural systems became integral subsystems of the global system of international relations. This took place also under the influence, beginning in the 1960's, of a weakening dependence, or perhaps certain kinds of interdependence in international relations (e.g., formation of ECC had an effect on the change in the interdependency relationship of Western Europe and the United States[16]; the China-Soviet conflict also brought a series of changes into the interdependency network within the pale of socialism).

In examining the specific hierarchical levels of contemporary international relations in the context of international interdependency factors, we can simply assume that the following interdependency factors dominate at specific levels:

At the level of global interdependency:

-- peace as a result of the armaments race and growing expenditures for these purposes, the appearance of constantly new centers of military conflict and the growing, from this viewpoint, destabilization of the present world order;

-- energy-raw materials, whose form underwent radical change in the last decade, causing a drastic politicization of economic international relations;

-- ecological, as a result of the development of large-scale technology (including transport);

-- the search for new balance in the world economy, including in the intercontinental cross-section. The harmonization of the economic interests of developed and developing countries, and the consolidation of these arrangements into a stable and secure world system, wrote J. Stefanowicz, will, in large measure, determine the future of international relations.[17] The Brandt Commission report contains an interesting proposition regarding this.[18]

At the supraregional interdependency level:

-- peace as a result of nuclear threat, particularly on the European continent, which is a region that is closely controlled from the standpoint of the principle

---

[16] P. Landau: "Spor o jednosc polityczna Europy Zachodniej" [The Dispute over the Political Unity of Western Europe], Warsaw, 1977, pp 79-80, 95-126.

[17] J. Stefanowicz: op.cit., p 152.

[18] "North-South: A Programme for Survival". London and Sydney, 1980.

of strategic balance between two leading world powers, the USSR and the United States. In other regions of the world also, the threat of nuclear attack is beginning to appear, which gives the problem of strategic and political balance in the world a new dimension, confronting, e.g., the large social movements and also the states of different political systems with new political and ideological problems;

-- shifting the "focal point" of contemporary international political relations to the Near and Middle East area, where political and military events have had an impact for some time on the dynamics of balance in the United States-Western Europe-USSR-China arrangement;

-- technological. Recently with increasing frequency evaluations and specialists' reports have been appearing which formulate a thesis on the disappearance of the technological gap (in its hitherto form) between Europe and the United States, which is now also seen in the equalization of technico-economic conditions of production between ECC countries and the United States and also in the growing production and capital dominance of the countries of the "nine". This will also have an impact on the increased role of the leading countries of Europe in the world economy in the 1980's;

-- ecological, pertaining to continental Europe due to the higher network of infrastructural interconnections. But this pertains also to other regions of the world, as reported in detail by the Brandt Commission.

At the regional level, interdependencies are most highly intensified due to the geographical proximity of countries, economic interconnections, political alliances, etc.[19]

At the bilateral level, it is the question of the cooperation or competition of two sovereign states. From the standpoint of the international environment, the scale and importance of this level to higher levels varies according to the rank of the partners in these relations. The effect of current United States-USSR relations on international politics or on global international relations, for example, is particularly important.

The contemporary multilevel structure of international relations has made it possible to more fully satisfy the needs and national interests of individual countries, and thus has created structural premises for the optimization of goals in the foreign policy of these countries. Of course, the multilevelness of this structure also created new types of conflicts, appropriate to the contemporary international relations, but which previously did not exist or were "frozen".

During the process of the optimization of these goals and the means by which they may be attained, use is made of the common interests of international relations units and their collectivities, and also the conflicts in interests occurring between these units and collectivities. The interdependence of international relations units becomes a reality precisely when interests are identical or concurrent (e.g., the defense of peace, or a threat to the ecology); when interests are divergent (e.g., in North-South relations); when interests conflict (e.g., USSR-United

---

19. "Regionalism w stosunkach miedzynarodowych" [Regionalism in International Relations]. Collected Works. J. Gilas, Editor. Warsaw, 1978.

States relations and political interests ensuing from globalism in the foreign policy of both powers, or Poland-FRG relations in the context of the so-called German problem).

As has already been stated, interdependency designates the objective limits and capabilities of the normatively conceived interdependency of states and nations on the international arena. In the foreign policy of small- and medium-sized states, this interdependency is taken as one of the axioms of all discussion on the subject of limits of sovereignty, freedom of action in relation to the international environment and the feasibility of fulfilling national interests. It appears that the state of interdependency to an increasing degree is now also beginning to determine the activities of the large powers, including both superpowers. All of the politicians' analyses and calculations or more broadly, the decision-making centers that formulate the states' foreign policy strategy, take this expanding and consolidating interdependency as a starting point. It now designates in a basic way not only the activities but even more broadly, the behavior of states in relation to the development of political events in a given country. This state of interdependency is responsible for the fact that the basic criterion of evaluation becomes, on the whole, the general acceptance of the political status quo, comprehended in a strictly defined sense (compare CSCE). This refers primarily to the evaluation of political events occurring in Europe, which is a "tropic" of its own in the global international system. A classic example of such political evaluations of states (both small and medium powers as well as superpowers) is the official reaction of the outside world to the political events of our country in 1980. As a result of the universal recognition of the political status quo in Europe, the leading politicians of the capitalist states from the beginning declared their vital interest in a solution to the crisis which would allow Poland to maintain a permanent place in the system of political and military alliances and groups on the European continent.

Along with the specific network of needs and interests appearing at a given level of international relations, each of these levels is involved in four groups of common problems due to the nature of the relations at the given level, or to the determining role for a given level (e.g., bilateral) in the problem situation of other (e.g., higher) levels of international relations. The four problems that are common to the whole of international relations are: military-strategic, political, economic, and cultural.

Poland expresses its position on each of these problems operating on particular levels of international relations:

-- as a member of the global collectivity of international relations units (UN);

-- as a member of the global collectivity of socialist states (world socialist system);

-- as an element of world or European public opinion (through utterances of its political leaders, by means of various propaganda or protest campaigns);

-- as a signatory to international treaties and agreements (e.g., as a participant in the CSCE process);

-- as a member of a military and political alliance (Warsaw Pact) or a regional integration grouping (CEMA);

-- as a geopolitical unit in relation to the political problems of a closely defined geographic region (E.g., the Rapacki Plan in 1957 on the denuclearization of Poland, the CSSR, GDR and FRG, or as a participant in the conference of Baltic-bordering countries);

-- as the fatherland for a large emigration, which currently encompasses 11-14 million citizens of different countries. This ethnic factor began to be actively utilized in Polish foreign policy at the start of the 1970's for the implementation of the need to participate and consolidate Poland's position in international relations;

-- as a member of the European civilizational-cultural circle,[20] especially on problems concerning the preservation and development of European cultural assets;

-- as an individual partner, who by means of bilateral political, economic and cultural relations desires to develop cooperation with every other UN member state.[21] That is why, for example, without regard to existing divisions, and making particular use of the ethnic factor, Poland has been successfully developing its relations with the United States since the mid-1950's.

A similarly expanded typology can be presented in analyzing Poland's nongovernmental international relations, established through various organizations (or individuals appearing in organizational roles), which have our legal approbation and function on the territory of the Polish state. We refer here to such units in the international circles as political parties (particularly the PZPR), denominational groups (particularly the Catholic Church), scientific associations, economic enterprises, creative societies etc. The activities of these nongovernmental international relations units is very important for a state's foreign policy, beginning with co-shaping of this policy and ending with its concretization and practical implementation. The activity of these nongovernmental units contributes to the optimization of a state's foreign policy. It can also be observed here that the development and fulfillment of the need for participation and activity in an international environment is fully implemented through the expanded activity of nongovernmental international relations units.

In analyzing the whole of Poland's activities as a state, as a unit of international relations, and as the collectivity of nongovernmental units participating in these relations, it can be said that in the 1970's the role of nongovernmental participants (Polish) in international relations, grew markedly. This was the result of the normalization of international relations in Europe, especially in connection with the so-called German problem. This was also the result of a global international

---

[20] M. Dobroczynski and J. Stefanowicz: "Tozsamosc Europy" [Europe's Identity], Warsaw, 1980.

[21] "Poland's Active Role in the Struggle for Peace and Security. Materials from the Deputies' Debate in the PPR Sejm on June 24, 1980". Warsaw, 1980.

international process, begun on the threshold of the 1970's and called the beginning of a historical turn towards political, and, in part, military detente, favoring the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. At the heart of this process were USSR-United States relations, based on strategic military balance and the recognition by both sides of mutual responsibility for world peace.[22]

The described processes, which occurred in the totality of global and European relations, in turn lay at the bases of another process, namely the progressing asymmetry in international relations. This asymmetry became an important optimizing factor in Poland's foreign policy as a medium-sized state and in the totality of international relations under the given historical conditions.

The indication of this asymmetry in international relations was the fact that Poland as a member of the world socialist system and within its framework as a participant in the politico-military community (Warsaw Pact) and the economic integration grouping (CEMA), at the same time could show a full measure of its political subjectivity in Europe-wide relations, sometimes playing the role of a verifier of the intentions of the participants in these relations.[23] On the production, scientific-technical, and currency-credit plane, Poland significantly expanded its relations with the West, creating, for the next 10 to 20 years, broad structural premises of mutual economic interconnections. Poland was always an element in European culture, but now the passing decade has made it possible for her, although with various limitations on the part of the West, to more fully participate in all-European processes of creating and consuming cultural goods.[24] Furthermore, as new political potentials appeared on the international arena, Poland went back to the traditions of interstate cooperation with France, Great Britain, Italy, Austria, the Scandinavian countries, and also the United States.

The discussed phenomenon of asymmetry in international relations gained a new dimension towards the end of the 1970's, and particularly in 1980, when Soviet-American relations suddenly deteriorated. The United States at that time introduced an embargo on deliveries of grain and modern technology to the USSR and announced a boycott of the Olympics in Moscow, attempting at the same time to force its NATO allies to make similar decisions. Only certain Western countries, for various reasons, were subjected to United States' political pressure. A situation like this in the 1960's, and even more so, in the 1950's, would have been unthinkable.

The cited examples of asymmetry in East-West relations, both on the part of the Atlantic Alliance as well as on the part of the Warsaw Pact, show that a mutually recognized strategic military balance between both allies and, above all, between the USSR and the United States, qualitatively created a new situation for the development of international interdependency on the lower levels of international relations

---

[22] M. Dobroczynski and J. Stefanowicz: "East-West Policy. Capabilities and Limitations". SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, 1979, No 2.

[23] M. Dobrosielski: "Reflections on Polish Foreign Policy". SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, 1979, No 7-8.

[24] "Trwale wartosci kultury polskiej" [Lasting Values of Polish Culture]. Warsaw, 1978, pp 107-112.

and for a climate of dialogue and confidence in East-West relations. It opened up new vistas for the process of a specific self-containment of Europe as regards events on other continents, as was shown, inter alia, by the "offer to Europe" formulated by L. I. Brezhnev early in 1980 after the events relating to Afghanistan, and then his meeting with V. Giscard d'Estang in May, 1980 in Warsaw, and with H. Schmidt in June-July, 1980 in Moscow.

In generalizing these observations, it should be stated that at the threshold of the 1980's there was a distinct growth in the importance of the intermediate levels (supraregional and regional) in international relations. At the same time, there was a growth in the importance of medium- and small-sized states, particularly those maintaining a high level of national identity.[25]

This situation is not only the result of a mutually accepted strategic military balance of both superpowers. It results also to a great degree from an actual departure from globalist concepts in the foreign policy of West European powers. Globalism as an attribute of foreign policy can today really pertain only to two superpowers. This new situation should become firmly established in the next few years. It will doubtless change the outlook of the European countries on the problems of global politics and events on the fringes of the Europe-wide system. At the same time it may perhaps allow both superpowers to more thoroughly analyze events occurring in the Europe-wide dimension and to recognize the objective aims of the European states to maintain the identity of the old continent.

Thus on the brink of the 1980's we more clearly observe the shaping of a peculiar nucleus in the global system of international relations, which becomes the Europe-wide system. It is characterized by a stability of political game rules, based on acceptance of the territorial and political status quo, the homogeneity of basic cultural values, the growing scope of economic, technological, and scientific-engineering cooperation, and an understanding of the need for cooperation in these spheres, which determine the basic conditions for peaceful existence in the international European community.[26] From these premises ensue important conclusions for Polish foreign policy, for its directions, dynamics, initiatives, and finally, for the evolving structure of linkage with the outside world. The category of interdepence as a basic characteristic which determines the activity of states in contemporary international relations, and the size and mutual overlapping of roles in which Poland appears, will confront our foreign policy with new problems and dilemmas. They should be solved each time on the basis of political directives which prove that the Polish reason of state, understood to be the reason of social state and therefore the primary interest of the Polish nation, is the basic determinant of our activities in relation to the international environment.[27]

---

[25] J. W. Szeremeta: "National Identity in the Contemporary World". SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, 1979, No 11.

[26] J. Symonides: "A Category of International Community" in "Marksistowska nauka stosunkow miedzynarodowych (pojecia-terminy-kategorie)" [Marxist Teachings of International Relations (Concepts-Terms-Categories)]. E. J. Palyg and J. Symonides, Editors. Warsaw, 1979, pp 63-78.

[27] E. Wojtaszek: "Main Directives and Tasks of Polish Foreign Policy - Information Delivered at the PPR Sejm on June 26, 1980" in "Aktywna Rola Polski (...)" [Poland's Active Role (...)], pp 13-29.

The External Factor and Internal Factor in State Policy

The determinants (needs, interests) of Polish foreign policy may be the internal political determinants, e.g., the striving for normalization of Poland-Vatican relations, which was achieved during the 1970's as one of the elements in the normalization of Church-State relations. These may also be internal economic determinants, e.g., the striving in 1980 to negotiate foreign loans on favorable terms to improve supplies of raw materials and other materials for our industry.

Foreign policy determinants may also be internal policy determinants; e.g., changes in the distribution of forces in Europe under the influence of the NATO decision late in 1979 forced Poland to immediately enter into consultations within the framework of the Warsaw Pact, to approve the decisions made by the Pact on an immediate increase in budgetary expenditures for defense purposes and on taking a public position on an international forum, expressing firm disapproval of the NATO decision. These may also be internal economic determinants, e.g., protectionist moves by the Common Market in the 1960's regarding Polish export of agro-food articles to countries of this area and the necessity to periodically negotiate the amounts and conditions of this export with EEC representatives.

The determinants of a state's foreign policy may cross over and have a "mixed" character. These will then be determinants of economic foreign policy-external, political-internal, economic-internal, political-external, etc.[28] A classic example of crossover of foreign policy determinants may be the problem of supplying the Polish economy with imported crude oil.

Foreign policy may be examined using two analytical models. In the first model, Poland's international environmental state is treated as a constant. Under such research assumptions, an answer is sought to the question of what has been achieved in internal policy or within the scope of existing international interconnections to satisfy the state's socioeconomic and political needs and interests. In the second model, the state of Poland's international environment is treated as a variable dependent within certain historically determined limits.[29] Answers are also sought to the question of what further could have been done in the foreign policy area. The second model assumes the existence in the international environment of a potential which for various reasons has not been utilized by the foreign policy of a given state. Of course, concrete historical conditions, both internal as well as international, are decisive here. But they always remain in a state of a specific dynamic, which also determines the dynamics of foreign policy goals and means.[30]

---

[28] A. Bodnar: op.cit., p 66 and foll.

[29] J. Topolski: "Rozumienie historii" [Understanding History], Warsaw, 1978, pp 94-187.

[30] K. Sobczak: "Some Foreign Policy Means (A Test of Characteristics)" in "Teoretyczne problemy (...)" [Theoretical Problems (...)], pp 101-110.

The above-described analytical models can also be used in predicting a state's foreign policy, although both practitioners as well as researchers often do this intuitively, applying two parallel courses of reasoning, which acknowledge[31]:

a) the state of the international environment as an independent variable of a state's foreign policy, but the state's internal needs and interests as a dependent variable (elementary historical examples of this are supplied by the "cold war" years and the necessity to apply many self-limitations in order to implement the policy of industrialization in People's Poland and in other socialist countries);

b) the state's internal needs and interests as an independent variable, but the state of international environment as a dependent variable of the state's foreign policy (examples can be drawn from the early 1970's, when the historical move towards international detente and peaceful coexistence was begun).

The applications of models a and b as comparative models of foreign policy permits us to state the fact that certain global determinants (the cold war, detente) occur, which form the basis for the totality of contemporary international relations and also the foreign policy of each state. Hence in employing models a and b in predicting foreign policy, the structure of what we call the international environment and its probably dynamics, must be taken into account.

The 1980's will doubtless bring some new elements into the present network of international interdependence and will enhance the structure of these interdependencies. The contemporary complicated world in an extremely clear way determines the situation of individual countries. At the same time, the place and position of each nation depends in a very real way on its ability to adapt and develop in relation to the dynamics of international life.[32]

* * *

The events of recent months in Poland clearly indicate that all of the main units of our country's political system--together with the leadership of the Catholic Church and the leaders of the independent, self-governing trade unions--are deeply interested in the indissolubility of the PPR's political alliances. This position is not only an expression of the political interests of the leading social forces in our country, but it also concurs with the vital political interests of the Soviet Union and the countries of Western Europe and North America. The stability of People's Poland's alliances and their will to endure, confirms the genuineness of detente.

One of the great marvels in Polish events, is that while not questioning the lastingness of the alliances, they stipulate also that they be more efficiently and effectively utilized to surmout the crisis and to raise the ability of our country to adapt to the technological, economic and social changes occurring in the international environment. On the other hand, however, everything that pertains to international detente and the prevention of using Europe for purposes of global confrontation, cannot be a matter of indifference to us.

---

[31] See on this subject L. Pastusiak: "Komputery a polityka" [Computers and Politics], Warsaw, 1975.

[32] J. Symonides: "Several Comments on Foreign Policy Research[, PRZEGLAD STOSUNKOW MIEDZYNARODOWYCH, 1978, No 1, pp 7-15.

This means that Poland, as a result of the internal transformations that are taking place, is even more interested in peaceful international cooperation, bec. se this cooperation is one of the guarantees that we will successfully emerge from the crisis in our country and that the transformations worked out in social agreements will be lasting ones. This directive should, in the 1980's, determine our presence in international relations and the level of our country's political activity as one of the elements of the infrastructure of the Europe-wide system, whose bases were established by the CSCE Final Act. We should, therefore, regard our active presence on the international arena in the 1980's as one of the important conditions of the durability of the renewal process. This requires that we give our international activities a more genuine, depersonalized quality, conforming to the model of political culture created today, both in the leadership system and in the social system.

9295
CSO: 2600/246

ROUNDTABLE ON REVOLUTIONARY HUMANISM, HUMAN RIGHTS

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 7, 5 Apr 81 and No 8, 20 Apr 81

/Discussion of "Revolutionary Humanism and Human Rights in the World of Today" by Prof Dr Docent Ioan Ceterchi, Prof Dr Dumitru Ghise, Prof Dr Ivanciu Nicolae-Valeanu, Prof Dr Dumitru Mazilu, Prof Dr Marin Voiculescu, Prof Dr Ladislau Lorincz, Aurel Cristescu, Dr Eugenia Stefan, Prof Dr Mircea Nicolaescu, Gabriela Mona^u, scientific researcher, Reader Dr Brindusa Stefanescu, Lucretia Vacar, scientific researcher, Lecturer Dr Mariana Draghici, and Reader Dr Victor Duculescu, arranged by the Institute for Political Sciences and Study of the National Question in the Stefan Gheorghiu Academy jointly with ERA SOCIALISTA/

/No 7, 5 Apr 81 pp 40-43/

/Text/ IOAN CETERCHI: Our discussion concerns the very far-reaching and also highly controversial questions of human rights in the contemporary world. On the basis of its own wealth of experience in achieving real democratic rights and freedoms, Romania is making an intensive effort toward international cooperation to promote universal respect for human rights. Romania's position and efforts to that end are influenced by Party Secretary General Nicolae Ceausescu's revolutionary, scientific and profoundly humanistic thinking, characterized as it is by a high sense of responsibility for promotion of a new humanism in international affairs and for a principled and constructive approach to these important questions in the light of the great and complex problems of the world of today.

Romania accordingly favors and resolutely supports establishment of a basis of cooperation primarily emphasizing the basic human rights and opposing the attempts to disparage cooperation by bringing up minor and marginal points as well as the confusion on the subject that some foreign circles are trying to create.

The purpose of international cooperation in this field is to support the states' and nations' own efforts to take adequate steps to promote and secure human rights, because each state alone can provide for assertion of the dignity and worth of the person by virtue of its sovereignty and the means available to it. As in all fields of international collaboration, cooperation to promote human rights must be based upon strict observance of the basic principles of international law, especially national sovereignty and independence and noninterference in internal affairs. The sovereign states and nations, free and equal in rights, are the only natural framework in which individual rights and freedoms can and must be achieved.

Full assertion and universal respect for human rights are impossible unless we eliminate serious contemporary phenomena that gravely impair development of the human condition, such as the present unjust international order, perpetuation of underdevelopment and division of the world into rich and poor countries, the policy of spheres of influence and domination, hunger, illiteracy, unemployment, and the lack of elementary material and cultural living conditions for hundreds of millions of people, conditions essential to the sacred right to existence and to a decent living standard.

Establishing a lasting peace on earth and a climate of peaceful security and, in close connection with that aim, achievement of general disarmament and especially nuclear disarmament are first considerations for promoting real human rights. Allocation of immense material and human resources for military outlays, a heavy burden upon all peoples, has very bad effects upon implementation of the basic human rights, especially the economic, social and cultural rights. Stockpiling and improvement of nuclear weapons and design of new types of weapons of mass destruction endanger the very existence of man on earth. Although it is not expressly included in the documents that establish human rights and freedoms internationally, the right to peace has always been implied and presumed as an essential for human existence and development and as an implicit right necessary for the exercise of man's right to live.

It is unquestionably to the credit of Romanian policy that it approaches the problem of human rights with such a universal, comprehensive and realistic viewpoint that can mobilize the progressive forces everywhere and all peoples to resolve the main problems of the times that critically determine the complete and profoundly humanistic assertion of human rights in the world of today.

DUMITRU GHISE: I think correct understanding of the determinations of the concept of revolutionary humanism in the approach to human rights requires indication not only of the continuity but also of the discontinuity between the dialectical-materialist and historical conception of man and humanism and the various theories that preceded its formulation.

Socialist humanism is the opposite of all theological conceptions of man. By the very interpretation of man as a being created by a transcendent power and by relating his destiny to divinity, the theological conceptions shift human problems from the terrestrial space of real life to an illusory, supernatural, transcendent space "beyond"! In other words, the theological proposition is merely a subterfuge in the attempt to evade and not to solve the problems. And as Mihai Ralea said, interest in human affairs means laicism, a secularized state of mind and no Edenic or mystic-paradisiacal one.

It is no accident that Marx said in the "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts" in 1844 that positive humanism cannot appear and practical humanism cannot be established without claiming a truly human life as an inalienable attribute of man. Marx wrote, "As a rejection of God, atheism means establishment of theoretical humanism... Atheism is humanism self-determined by rejection of religion..." The humanism founded by Marx is also the reverse of all individualistic conceptions of man. For Marx, as he said in his famous commentaries on Feuerbach, "Man is the product of social relations." Therefore man's problems can be solved only by solving the problems of the society to which he belongs. This lent humanism a new content whose theoretical and practical core is associated with the struggle to liberate the working class, "which cannot be liberated without liberating all mankind."

Revolutionary humanism also differs from the rationalist-illuminist kind of humanism, although it presupposes and implies it. The reverse of religious conceptions and conceived in conflict with medieval ideology and rationalist anthropocentrism (of an illuminist kind, correctly speaking), it denied the illusory world "beyond" and demonstrated that there is no way of acquiring human dignity and freedom other than action upon man himself. But neither could the illuminist approach provide a complete solution to the problems of humanism because in anthropocentric fashion it emphasized human subjectivity alone. By seeking solutions only within man, in his mentality and morality, illuminism transcended human problems only in the subject, in "this world."

Breaking the bonds of these ideas, revolutionary humanism expresses human problems in their real, historical-social terms provided by the scientific, dialectical-materialist view of the relationships between existence and consciousness, objective and subjective, individual and society, possibility and reality, necessity and freedom. The aims of true humanism, liberation and development of the human personality and the autonomy, dignity and worth of the individual, can be accomplished only by eliminating the objective social and historical conditions that rob man of his human character, by abolition of exploitation and any forms of alienation accompanied by regular and general educational work on subjectivity, and by forming and developing a new human consciousness.

In view of those considerations the RCP makes a continuing twofold effort to create both the material and cultural conditions essential to all-around development of the human personality, to develop the workers' revolutionary awareness, and to carry out the principles of socialist ethics and justice. The RCP feels abolition of private ownership of the production means, the constant rise of the living standard, and social relations based upon justice, equality, democracy and freedom are only the objective requirement and the necessary framework for the fuller manifestation and development of the human personality. If humanism is to be truly consolidated in all its connections, it is necessary to conduct, on these grounds and in keeping with them, a complete and general historical process of education in and by work, one of vocational instruction reinforced by continuing expansion of the general-cultural horizon, and one of mastery of science and the revolutionary conception of the world. Only such a series of objective and subjective measures can transform the man himself into an advanced man with a high humanistic and revolutionary awareness who can play an active part in social activity and in historical construction of the new society.

IVANCIU NICOLAE-VALEANU: The concept of human rights is a very broad one clearly involving, in particular ways, not only the legal sciences but also other sciences of society like economics, history, philosophy, sociology etc. First it has a generally human content or character that includes the rights inherent in any human being, especially the right to live and work. Of course human rights vary with the social structure and the circumstances under which they are exercised. Moreover the concept of human rights involves a succession and a correlation of them, since man is viewed as an individual, as a member of a social class or group, and as a citizen of a country. No correlation or balance among the human rights on the three levels (individual, class and country) is set automatically in all societies. Despite his proclaimed rights, the individual in capitalist society feels alienated and repressed, as Fr. Perroux commented, or like a "sad robot with a happy look," as J. K. Galbraith described him, and the rights of the individual as a member of a class are correlated with his rights as a citizen of the country by the complicated mechanisms of the class struggle. In socialist society, based on public ownership of the production means,

there is the objective basis for a good correlation of the rights of man as an individual and as a member of a restricted community (group, class or social category) and as a citizen of the country.

Since the world is in a transitional period wherein different social orders coexist, human rights must be analyzed specifically according to each society and comparative study of them is becoming an elementary requirement. It is frequently done but not always correctly. The current comparative studies of human rights in the Western literature follow the formula that under capitalism a man has the right to have privately owned factories, plants and estates while under socialism he does not. Since this is a fundamental right, it means that under socialism people have no rights. Such "comparative studies" serve neither science nor good understanding and coexistence between peoples exercising their rights and fulfilling their obligations under different social orders. Comparative studies of human rights in different societies can serve progress in science and in real life only if they indicate whether those rights are merely proclaimed or actually implemented, whether they apply to all members of the society (also actually and not merely in declarations of principle), whether it is really possible to exercise them, whether the economic, social, political, ideological and other mechanisms strike a balance in assignment (and exercise) of rights and obligations, or whether some receive more rights while others receive more obligations. And all this, I repeat, not in word but actually in deed. What lends a clear note of superiority to the socialist system of human rights is creation of conditions favorable to their exercise by the entire people.

The idea of the right to private ownership as "basic" to man's independence and prosperity and to the progress and welfare of communities and as a "natural and eternal right" is the "warhorse" of the neoliberal school, whose important representatives include Ludwig Erhardt, the former chancellor of the FRG, Milton Friedmann in the United States, Jacques Rueff in France, Von Hayek, laureate of the Nobel Prize for Economics, Von Mises and many others. The idea that private ownership is basic to individual freedom and community progress is also the fundamental premise of the neoliberals' apologetic stand on capitalism and of the libelous criticisms of socialism.

But by whom and how is private ownership held under capitalism today? As we know the production means, the main material substance of the right to private ownership, has been concentrated in the form of capital in the hands of a few gigantic national and international monopolies that have at their command the labor of hundreds of thousands and even millions of workers whose only property is their capacity to work and create values. The owners of big capital have all the rights and many freedoms in their enterprises and in society, and what kind of "rights" and "freedoms" does this sort of private ownership accord the man who only has his working capacity?

The experience of history shows that private ownership of the production means is a brake on progress and prevents the exercise of human rights for most of the population. It is the new kind of socialist ownership of the production means that permits the formation and operation of the economic, political and social mechanisms wherein the rights of man freed from exploitation can be actually exercised, since it is essential not merely to proclaim rights in constitutions, codes and regulatory enactments but to make it possible for all people to exercise them and not just a privileged class.

DUMITRU MAZILU: I agree with the views expressed here as to the complexity of the concept of human rights to the effect that it has several aspects, economic, political,

legal etc. Note the importance of the legal aspect in defining and enforcing human rights, namely regulation of the rights and freedoms of the individual and the guarantees of their application in practice.

Experience tells us that proclamation of individual rights and freedoms is a necessary step but it is not sufficient for implementing the status of the person. As pointed out in our discussion, it has proved essential to enforce the rights and freedoms of every person in the economic, political and social processes and in human relations. The profound humanism of the socialist law established in Romania lies in the fact that while proclaiming the rights and freedoms it also enacts a whole system of real guarantees of their enforcement.

Note also that in the recent confrontations of contemporary ideas more and more writers, specialists and scientists are beginning to insist upon a system of guarantees, especially economic ones, to ensure the actual exercise of civil rights. For instance several of those attending the Seventh Conference of European Associations for the United Nations (Cologne, 25-29 November 1980) pointed out the urgency of immediate measures for effective enforcement of the law at work and in instruction and education for all citizens without discrimination. In pointing out the hardships of the migrant workers in Europe, the West German delegation stressed the need on both the national and regional levels (European Economic Community (Common Market), UN Economic Commission for Europe, UNESCO) of "efforts to improve the legal, economic, social and cultural situation of the migrant workers and their families," while the Dutch delegation pointed out the necessity of "eliminating quantitative and qualitative discrimination against those workers." In stressing the importance of securing the quality of life of all human beings, the Austrian delegation in its turn noted the urgency of improving the housing, transport and general living conditions of all citizens, and the Swedish delegation said "the question of guaranteeing employment is becoming increasingly important."

The problems of guaranteeing civil rights and providing the conditions essential to work, instruction and education without discrimination have been taken up in many other international discussions, with increasing emphasis upon the vital importance of effective guarantees of civil rights and freedoms in all countries of the world. There is no question that there are significant developments in the concept of human rights that will be reflected in the practical effort to directly implement the status of the person and his inalienable rights to work, culture and life everywhere in the world.

MARIN VOICULESCU: The exercise of human rights in theory and practice makes it clear that the concept is far broader than some Western pedants suggest. It is not confined to freedom of marriage between citizens of different countries, or to problems of tourist travel, exchange of information etc. Any realistic approach to the concept and the far-reaching problems of the fundamental rights and obligations of the individual must first consider the basic aspects. And if we are to speak of priorities, the first priority is the right to life, peace, and civilised, equitable cooperation. And the right of the individual and the citizen to work, a worthy and abundant life, culture, and intellectual fulfillment is a "priority among priorities."

When we view them in this light, we see why the individual's elementary, vital rights cannot be fulfilled in societies that perpetuate social and class inequality and injustice and promote, intentionally or not, cooperation between economically and socially unequal persons.

When we consider the developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, we shall come to no pertinent or true conclusion unless we realise that those countries, which include over two-thirds of the world's population, do not enjoy elementary economic, social or cultural rights and that in those areas people are still dying of hunger and thirst in unimaginable and incredible numbers. UN and UNESCO official sources point to an even more dangerous aggravation of the gap between the rich and poor worlds. The extremes of poverty, famine, relentless diseases and ignorance and of luxury, abandon and opulence are among the most incredible anachronisms of our century. A prey to physical and mental starvation alike, the so-called "third world" shows how precarious is the pose of the current bourgeois doctrine as a bearer of the banner of human rights. Today there can be no question of human rights or obligations outside the struggle to close the gap between rich and poor or outside the struggle for a new international order, which are both rights and basic obligations of the states, the nations, the peoples and every citizen.

I would mention that bourgeois political scientists, jurists, sociologists and economists have recently been trying to make the point that today and especially in the future human rights can be "effectively resolved" in institutional forms beyond the limits of the national state as they are increasingly exercised in supernational institutions. It is not difficult to see the more or less direct connection between these theoretical "breakthroughs" and the well-known nihilist theories about sovereignty. Clearly the states' and nations' independence and sovereignty are indispensable to the exercise of human rights, and the very enforcement of human rights requires the citizen's active participation in economic, social, political and cultural-intellectual affairs in the ways provided by the independent and sovereign states and nations.

LADISLAU LORINCZ: Some references have been made in the discussion to development and improvement of civil rights as a process under socialism. I wish to point out that the process is not confined to expansion and multiplication of civil rights and freedoms or their quantitative growth. Actually it is a complex process of constant change and edvolution, with distinctive characteristics in every stage of social development. Any treatment of civil rights and freedoms that ovelooks these complex correlations and interactions risks falling into a harmful, unscientific distortion of reality and the stage in which those rights and freedoms occur in a given country. Such a one-sided and abstract treatment appears in various ideological confrontations wherein human rights are often presented as static, timeless and divorced from their social-political and geographic-historical context.

Human rights have never been immutable once and for all but are determined by the actual state of the respective society and partly by the socioeconomic conditions and partly by the political conditions. It is readily seen how greatly human rights differ from one historical order to another. When we consider the socioeconomic and political conditioning of human rights, it follows that they are and can only be the rights that the given level of social development in a given country can give the members of society.

But socioeconomic rights cannot be separated from political ones, as representatives of current bourgeois ideology would often have it. For example, what good are political rights (like the right to vote and to be elected) in a society where the material inequalities are so great that nearly all the population has only the right to vote with no real alternatives or any prospect of solving such great social problems as the economic crisis, inflation, unemployment etc. Capitalist society is

structurally incapable of unity of economic, social and political freedoms.

In socialist Romania, where the power belongs to the workers and the people, civil rights and freedoms are in full accord with the developmental level of Romanian society in its present historical stage. Socialist Romania's whole constitutional development shows expansion and intensification of civil rights and freedoms in keeping with the nation's general outlook.

AUREL CRISTESCU: International discussions and debates about human rights often overlook individual obligations, which have the same value as individual rights and freedoms, counterbalance them, and form the modern concept of human rights together with them. Rights and obligations are organically correlated in any society. In legal logic, any right has its corresponding obligation. One person's right is the others' obligation to observe it.

The basic civil rights and obligations are established in the states' constitutions and internal legislation, and limitations and restrictions on the exercise of human rights are introduced by internal legislation. Even important international instruments concerning human rights regulate individual obligations as well as the limitations and restrictions that can be placed upon the exercise of individual rights. The "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" specifies on this subject that "Any person has obligations to the community because that is the only way his personality can freely and fully develop."

In another connection, I think the peoples' right to self-determination (established in the UN Charter and developed in the international pacts on human rights) is one of the basic human rights and freedoms that is as important as individual rights. Its legal recognition is the inevitable and logical result of recognition of individual rights, from which it is inseparable, because individual rights cannot be respected nor individual equality and freedom secured unless the nation to which the respective individuals belong is free, independent and recognized as equal in rights to other nations.

The peoples' equality of rights and their right to self-determination are collective rights, but they vitally concern every individual because loss of those rights leads to loss of individual rights. Their implementation is essential to the exercise of all individual rights and freedoms. Therefore it is foremost among human rights and basic freedoms. It gives the peoples the right to free choice of their political system and the way to their economic, social and cultural development.

Universal implementation of the peoples' right to self-determination is vital to the guarantee and enforcement of individual rights.

The political aspect of the peoples' right to self-determination (namely their right to freely determine their international political status and to choose and develop their internal public system) is vital to the real exercise of their individual civil and political rights (equality, nondiscrimination, right to participate in political activity, freedom of conscience and opinion, etc.). Moreover implementation of the peoples' rights to independent economic, social and cultural development is fundamental if the individual economic, social and cultural rights are to be implemented. And promotion and protection of the individual rights and freedoms help to strengthen the peoples' right to self-determination.

[No 8, 20 Apr 81 pp 39-42]

[Text] EUGENIA STEFAN: In my talk I should like to refer to just one aspect, namely the cultural side of human rights. I consider this approach useful because the idea of a right to culture is also expressed in some international documents on human rights that have been mentioned in our discussion such as the International Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

In Romania the right to culture has a comprehensive and highly important content directly based on the nature and social precepts of construction of the fully developed socialist society. Guaranteeing the all-around cultivation of the human personality, our party and state have made culture an essential feature of the socialist nation's future on the path of material and intellectual progress and have created real opportunities for all Romanian citizens to see in culture both a right and an obligation of everyone.

One of the main characteristics of the right to culture is the unrestricted access of all workers regardless of nationality to the values of science, education and culture through an adequate scholastic and occupational training, the media of mass information and culture, a humanistic cultural creation and its adequate dissemination. The right to cultural creation on a macrosocial scale is illustrated by the National Cintarea Romaniei Festival, an extensive cultural demonstration uniting practically all the cultural units of Romania.

Another aspect of the right to culture is the right of the national minorities in Romania to create a culture of their own, characteristic of each, to disseminate it to all Romanian citizens, and to benefit by all the achievements of science, art and culture and the mass information media. Of course all the aspects of this right cannot be examined in depth in our discussion, and so I think reconsideration of this subject from an interdisciplinary standpoint could help to "fix" the right to culture among the other civil rights recognized and guaranteed by the Romanian socialist state.

MIRCEA NICOLAESCU: I feel the international implications of the problems of human rights should be analyzed from a much broader viewpoint than that of a de jure recognition. The latter is no doubt a great achievement of mankind, but mere entry of these rights in treaties does not lend any of them any reality unless it is accompanied by provision for the necessary conditions, especially economic ones, for their implementation and unless steps are taken to enable all the earth's inhabitants to actually benefit by these rights. And from this standpoint the international reality of our times and the general picture presented by the actual level of socioeconomic development of most of the peoples of the world do not indicate any "equality" of the earth's inhabitants' rights to enjoy the benefits of civilization but, on the contrary, a profound inequality. This inequality could not be more graphically summarized by the great economic gaps among the countries of the world in 1978, between a per capita gross national product of $90 in some states to one of about $15,000 in others. These immense inequalities are also indictments of the capitalist system and the existing international order as regards observance of human rights, of the right to life, the right to work, and the right to culture.

Over 50 million people die every year in the "third world" countries, or as many as in World War II, and over one-third of those who die of famine are children. This is because imperialism and colonial domination have condemned most of mankind to underdevelopment, malnutrition and lack of medical care. How can one speak of "equal

assurance" of the fundamental right to work or the right to life when some countries offer people at birth a life expectancy of only 40 years? How can the unprecedented growth of unemployment in our times be explained, in the light of the propaganda disseminated by bourgeois ideology about "strict observance" of human rights in the capitalist countries? Actually unemployment is a logical consequence of the capitalist system, and it always accompanied the "consumer society" even in its best periods. But today unemployment is steadily worsening, condemning tens of millions of workers to idleness in the developed western states alone, while in the developing countries large quotas of manpower are permanently unused, underused or only partially used, and often wasted in unproductive activities due to poor development of the productive forces and underdevelopment.

And how is the "disinterested" and "generous" propagandistic outcry about the basic human rights to be interpreted, when in countries with populations over 1.3 billion 60 percent of the adult population (in some countries even over 80 percent) is illiterate? Those are a few fundamental points that must figure in any analysis of implementation of human rights. They place in their true light the great inequities of the international economic order and the capitalist system, inequities which seriously impair and sometimes incapacitate the human rights that are solemnly recognized and entered in almost all the constitutions of the bourgeois states.

GABRIELA MONAFU: The relationship between securing a nation's right to development and securing the basic rights and freedoms of its citizens was brought out during the 1970's, when the old "classical" and traditional concept of capitalist development (defining development in terms of economic growth alone) was proved outmoded. It became clear, and not to economists alone, that economic growth alone cannot eliminate underdevelopment and that if inequality and injustice are perpetuated it actually maintains poverty and oppression in the poor countries. A number of Western economists, including E. F. Schumacher, D. Seers and Andre G. Frank, concluded that "dependent" development of developing countries on the capitalist model of development is the main cause of underdevelopment and maintenance of exploitation and inequality. For example, A. G. Frank said in his work "Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America" (1971) that "National and international capitalism is the cause of underdevelopment in the past and is still causing it in the present." In his turn the American professor Bruce Russet said in an article entitled "Disarmament and the Basic Human Rights and Needs" in the journal BULLETIN OF PEACE PROPOSALS (1979) that "dependent" development aggravates the economic inequalities and political oppression in the poor countries.

The experience of the socialist countries and some recently liberated countries has proved that there are alternative ways of development. The people's participation in planning and implementation of national development in these countries is integrally related to expansion of democracy and the human rights and freedoms.

All this led to a consensus, mainly among the specialists, on the need of expanding developmental goals promoting moral values like equality, justice, freedom and participation in addition to material growth. In this view the attainment of such moral values is essential to material progress because it is well-known that no intensive economic, social and cultural development is possible under oppression. Meanwhile man becomes a subject of development as a free entity instead of an object of it. That requires the masses' purposeful participation in determining the developmental aims as well as in the effort to accomplish them. This lends national development a humanitarian aspect in the sense of "a process of widespread participation in pursuit

of social change to achieve the social and material progress (including greater equality and freedom) of the majority of the citizens, who thereby acquire greater control of the environment," as the American professor Everett M. Rogers, for example, defined it in his work "Anthropology of Modernization and Modernization of Anthropology" (1975).

So defined, the right to development is every nation's right to choose its own path of development in keeping with its ideals and aspirations and to opt for the socioeconomic system that allows it full achievement of the material and cultural progress of its people and of each and every citizen.

In this light it is surprising that some scientists can question the priority need of development for the poor countries. The American economist John K. Galbraith, in his work "The Nature of Mass Poverty" (1979), maintains that the poor are long "accustomed" to their lot and do not hope to remedy it, and he recommends maintaining the poor countries' poverty, among the measures to overcome underdevelopment, because poverty "when it is massive, is a state of stable equilibrium to which an economy of this kind will seek to return." This view also conflicts with the recommendations of the international economic authorities, who argue the need of maintaining high growth rates in the developing countries' economies. In recommending an annual average rate of economic growth of 5.6 percent for the developing countries in the 1980's, the president of the World Bank said in a talk in October 1979 that even at this growth rate "600 million people will be living under very precarious conditions."

BRINDUSA STEFANESCU: In connection with our discussion I think it would be of interest to consider another problem of great concern to the international community, especially recently, namely that of the position of women and women's rights. Promotion of equal rights for women and men in all social activities and provision everywhere in the world for women's fully equal participation in economic, social, political and cultural activities are required by the very fact that women are an important social force in the modern world.

Unfortunately in a large part of the world women are still kept under a regime of inequality, being deprived of a number of economic, social and political rights and prevented from contributing to their countries' socioeconomic development and to the solution of humanity's general problems. In various areas of the world there are still grave injustices concerning women's rights to work, medical care, education and instruction. Despite the express provisions of the national laws, largely in keeping with the international documents approved under the auspices of the ILO, many nonsocialist countries refuse women equal salaries for work equal to men's, and many women are paid only 65 percent of what men are paid for the same work. Many women are refused employment in industry and especially in the decision-making sector and management jobs. The fact is significant that women, who represent over half the world's population, hold only 34 percent of the remunerated jobs in the world's labor force. Even some industrialized countries pay women salaries 20-30 percent below those of men, like England (51-53 percent) or France, where women receive only 64-65 percent of what men are paid for the same work. The number of unemployed women exceeds the total number of unemployed by 50 percent in the industrialized Western countries. And note also the tendency to deny women access to the higher forms of qualification in many developed countries of the world.

This particularly justifies the effort of the United Nations and its bodies to draft universally valid international documents to stimulate international cooperation in

promoting women's rights and giving them an equitable status fully equal to that of men.

The World Conference for the International Women's Year held in Mexico in 1979 as well as the recent Copenhagen Conference of 1980 for the Women's Decade held under UN auspices were occasions for responsible discussions and a dialogue of the nations of the world joined in a united effort to find ways of improving the position of women, who are first to be affected by underdevelopment, racial discrimination, and imperialist, colonial or neocolonial policies. The three aims of the Women's Decade, equality, development and peace, are still basic problems of widespread concern to mankind, and while the conferences in Mexico and Copenhagen did not take up the status of women as a problem in itself, they discussed it in the broader context of those aims, entering broader aspects on the agenda like full equality of the nations, the right to independent development, the need of creating a new, right and just international economic order, the necessity of disarmament and especially nuclear disarmament, and abolition of the imperialist, colonial and neocolonial policy of force and dictation.

LUCRETIA VACAR: In view of the actual situations characterizing modern capitalist society, the present crisis in its system is in all its implications a human crisis as well. The "personality crisis" in the Western world flows from the existing gap between the individual as a personality and a society whose socioeconomic relations make him a source of profit. This phenomenon pointedly brings out the gravity of the situations confronting the "CM" system in that society of inequality and injustice and the many aspects involved in its increasingly pronounced alienation and depersonalization against the background of depreciated values and unilateral and arbitrary imposition of a system of social norms opposed to fulfillment of the individual's integrity and self-identity.

That is why the individual's acquisition of his own human nature is inseparable from construction of a new society that permits a high degree of socialization of the individual seen not as a means but as an end, namely the socialist society and the communist society of the future. But the opportunity created by socialism for a new relationship between society and the individual cannot be achieved automatically or without effort, but only as a purposefully pursued aim of social development. The Spanish Marxist Carlos Paris remarked, "The battle for socialism lies in the necessity of rescuing and recovering the individual, whose condition as responsible subject and author of his own life eliminates the necessity, which determines the logic of present-day capitalism, of depersonalizing him and making him a being programmed for production and consumption. Instead of that we must offer the alternative of true and correct integration of the individual in society and of society in the individual."

By its nature socialism offers the individual new opportunities for fulfillment and advancement, but if they are to become realities his role must be developed in the entire operation of society as a system and of its characteristic structures. In the light of the evolving basic components of social and individual existence, it may be said that in Romania socialist construction is gradually but surely transforming the objective facts of the human condition and adapting it to the structures of an authentic humanism.

This brings out the significance of man's right to life as a primary right without which no approach to human rights has any purpose. The importance and priority the RCP attaches to this requirement and to the problems and effective ways of meeting the material requirements for the existence of all members of Romanian society (by

scientific standards) lend distinctiveness to its policy, for which the individual is the supreme value and goal.

The fact is very relevant that the strategy for developing socialist Romanian society makes man its supreme goal in purposeful and planned fashion, as well as complete satisfaction of his ever growing and diversified living requirements and unrestricted development of his personality. The absolute purpose of the whole range of social activities is the individual in his living and actual reality as a versatile member of society and creation of the material and cultural background for the full development of his personality. Planning and accomplishment of this basic aim of social construction in the present stage of Romania's socialist development are foreign to any simplistic interpretation of human fulfillment. The individual, as a perfectible being, is transformed in the course of a long and complex process. He is not an accomplished reality but a being in course of fulfillment, and that fulfillment takes place on very different levels and in different ways.

MARIANA DRAGHICI: I regard examination of the institution of human rights in relation to the fundamental principles of international law as a problem of outstanding theoretical and practical importance. "Submission of explanations," "justifications" or "written declarations" at the request of committees or "commissions" of inquiry and the right of "dissatisfied" individuals to petition the "Committee" or "Court" to initiate measures are unquestionably acts of interference in essentially national affairs. Accordingly we think it significant that more and more scientists specializing in international law are sharing the view that human rights should be defended within the basic principles of international law, especially those of sovereignty and complete noninterference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, as the natural framework for fully applying and guaranteeing those rights. The principle of noninterference sets the limits for this collaboration, directing it toward normal relations among sovereign states with equal rights and toward ways and means of cooperation compatible with all the principles of conterporary international law, because the dignity of the sovereign, independent nation, equal to the other nations, corresponds to the dignity of the individual. We stress this point because "humanitarian interventions" have been increasingly frequent of late. How else could we decribe actions like those practiced by some official circles and even persons in a numberof Western countries concerning either the treatment of human problems in various other states or the possibilities of participation of some political groups or parties in governmental coalitions. Distorting the real purpose of international collaboration to promote and enforce human rights, these circles are inciting the national minorities to emigrate under the slogan of "completion of families" or under other "humanitarian" pretexts. Such activities have nothing in common with the spirit of detente and are also acts of encroachment and flagrant interference in the affairs of countries that have chosen a path of independent development and are building an independent future for themselves. It is significant that many Western authors acknowledge the illegality of this kind of intervention. The American authors Thomas M. Frank and Nigel S. Rodley quite rightly comment in a study of "humanitarian intervention" that "the idea of humanitarian intervention cannot be entirely separated from its context of the general 'principle' of intervention. There are few more reactionary ideas than this to have ever found an application in international law. The principle has enabled some foreign powers to invade sovereign states for every kind of false reason... But very little good has been accomplished in its name." The Frenchman Charles de Visscher says to the same effect that outside of treaty regulations governments regard their relations with their own nationals as essentially within their national competence.

Louis Delbez in his turn maintains that human rights as a problem are not within the province of the state, but he nevertheless acknowledges that "at the present time the rights of individuals do not exist and are not implemented except through the internal order." And H. F. Pauhys mentions the attempt to strengthen the individual's position in international relations, but he too admits that "there is no direct communication between international law and individuals, but only through the intermediary of the national channels."

Therefore human rights cannot be detached and imposed on states or their sovereignty which is the natural framework within which they are implemented. It is not reduction of sovereignty but its assertion that is the sine qua non for the real and effective guarantee of human rights.

VICTOR DUCULESCU: I also think we have seen in the Western technical literature in the last few years a veritable "campaign" against the states' sovereignty and the principle of noninterference in their internal affairs under the incredible pretext of "defense of human rights"! Those rights are elevated to the rank of a "universal principle" in the attempt to make the point that in comparison with human rights other legal standards and principles are of only "subsequent" or "subordinate" value! For example Prof Daniel Colard of Besancon University even maintains that in the matter of human rights "the states are not not prevented from intervening by the principle of noninterference in their internal affairs." Richard H. Ulman, a former professor at Princeton University and now in the management of the well-known daily THE NEW YORK TIMES goes even further, regretting that due to "international consciousness of a divided humanity" there is now no foreseeable possibility that "supernational authorities or states acting on their orders will maintain shock forces."

There is no question that such views do no service to the cause of detente and international collaboration and give rise to tension and distrust, and they are based upon fundamentally wrong premises, deliberately ignoring the unity and interdependence of the principles of international law and the connection and interaction among them that prohibits "isolation" of one principle and its opposition to the other standards and principles generally recognized and accepted by states. I consider this idea essential for defining the correlation between the national and international aspects of the problem of human rights, a point often misunderstood or intentionally distorted by certain circles interested in maintaining situations of international discord.

Under the present conditions of development of world relations, the international aspect of the problem of human rights need not be opposed to the internal one but, on the contrary, it is expected now more than ever to help fulfill, on the national level, the aspirations of human beings to peace, freedom and progress, crowning the efforts toward a new world of peace, toward disarmament, and toward new democratic and equitable relations among nations and peoples. In this connection I think one could rightly speak of humanization of international relations, as a process of basing relations among countries permanently upon the great, general-human values that equally concern people on all continents and of all races or, in a word, humanity in its entirety. In reference to this point, the famous Greek politician and intelectual Constantin Tsatsos, former president of Greece, said when he was elected an honorary member of the Romanian Academy that "The world must be humanized. The beautiful principles we have inscribed with letters of gold in our declarations and charters must gradually cease to be a sad irony in the face of the events taking place before our eyes."

It is an indisputable fact that the developing countries and new sovereign states are rejecting the idea of "models" or "patterns" for protecting human rights today. They cannot be "manufactured in the West and supplied for sale to Asians and Africans," as an Indian jurist quite rightly commented at the World Peace Through Law Congress in Madrid in 1979.

I feel humanization of international relations requires concentration of the efforts of the community of nations upon the real problems that actually require solution and not upon false or imaginary problems. The time has come, to repeat Jacques Freymond's expression, to form a "policy and a diplomacy of human rights" and a policy of peace and solidarity among nations based upon respect for the dignity and equality of all men and upon understanding of what humanity must do now for defense of the eternal values and for its constantly rising evolution toward the peaks of progress and civilization.

5186
CSO: 2700/273

MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WORKERS

Bucharest SCINTEIA TINERETULUI in Romanian 27 Jun 81 p 2

[List of members elected to Executive Bureau of the National Council of Workers at the 2d Council of Workers Congress]

[Text] President of the National Council of Workers: Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Executive Bureau of the National Council of Workers

First vice president of the National Council of Workers and President of the Executive Bureau:

1. Constantin Dascalescu, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee, RCP Central Committee secretary and president of the Council for Social-Economic Organization.

Vice presidents:

2. Iosif Banc, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee, RCP Central Committee secretary and president of the Central Council for Worker Control of Economic and Social Activity.

3. Gheorghe Oprea, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and first vice premier.

4. Ion Dinca, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and first vice premier.

5. Alexandrina Gainusa, first secretary of the Bacau County Party Committee and member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee.

6. Cornel Onescu, president of the Central Council of the General Union of Trade Unions and candidate member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee.

7. Ion Sirbu, first secretary of the Arges County Party Committee, member of the RCP Central Committee and Hero of Socialist Labor.

8. Ion Foris, first secretary of the Satu Mare County Party Committee and member of the RCP Central Committee.

9. Marian Avram, head of a team at the 23 August Enterprise in Bucharest, party committee secretary for the compressor section and Hero of Socialist Labor.

10. Maria Nacu, foreman at the Savinesti Combine for Threads and Synthetic Fibers, Neamt, and Hero of Socialist Labor.

11. Cornel Boca, foreman and president of the trade union committee at the sintering plant of the Galati Iron and Steel Combine and Hero of Socialist Labor.

12. Teodor Boncalo, head of a brigade at the Lupeni Mining Enterprise, Hunedoara, and Hero of Socialist Labor.

13. Elena Verona Burtea, party committee secretary and president of the Council Workers at the Bucharest Knitwear and Readymade Clothing Enterprise, candidate member of the RCP Central Committee and deputy to the Grand National Assembly.

14. Gheorghe Mihaescu, head of the Klinker furnace section at the Fieni Asbestos Cement and Binder Combine, Dimbovita, party committee secretary and president of the Council of Workers and Hero of Socialist Labor.

15. Victor Neagoe, foreman and head of the section for remote control apparatus production at the Romanian Regional Railroad, Craiova, and Hero of Socialist Labor.

Secretaries:

16. Marin Enache, head of a section at the RCP CC and RCP CC member.

17. Ioachim Moga, first deputy head of the Organizational Section of the RCP CC and RCP CC member.

18. Ioan Totu, secretary of the Supreme Council for Social-Economic Development and RCP CC member.

Members:

19. Floare Antal, foreman and Council of Workers member at the Solidarity Footwear Enterprise in Oradea, Bihor, and Hero of Socialist Labor.

20. Dumitra Antonie, spinner and head of a team at the Electric Power Enterprise in Craiova, Dolj, and Hero of Socialist Labor.

21. Dumitru Balulescu, foreman and head mechanic and party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Solvent Petrochemical Combine in Timisoara.

22. Maria Bobu, president of the National Council of Women.

23. Francisc Bokor, locksmith foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Sfintu Gheorghe Automobile Electric Apparatus Enterprise, Covasna, and member of the Central Auditing Commission.

24. Vasile-Stan Cazan, mechanic foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Buzau Enterprise for Wire and Wire Products and RCP CC member.

25. Nicu Ceausescu, UTC CC secretary and candidate member of the RCP CC.

26. Aurel Chiru, chief foreman, party committee secretary for the section and Council of Workers member at the Birlad Bearings Enterprise and Hero of Socialist Labor.

27. Ioan Cimpoies, head of a column, president of the trade union committee and general workers meeting at the Salaj Automobile Transportation Enterprise.

28. Aurora Cune, yarn worker, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Dunareana Textile Enterprise, Giurgiu.

29. Elena Deliu, chemist foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Slobozia Chemical Fertilizers Combine, Ialomita, and candidate member of the RCP CC.

30. Maria Diaconu, foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Dacia Enterprise and Hero of Socialist Labor.

31. Dumitru Diaconescu, foreman, head of a section at the Brasov Tractor Enterprise, Council of Workers member and Hero of Socialist Labor.

32. Gheorghe Dinu, director general at the Industrial Central for Petroleum and Mining Equipment, Ploiesti, and RCP CC member.

33. Maria Dranga, chief engineer at the Brasov Truck Enterprise and member of the Central Committee Bureau of the ODUS [expansion unknown].

34. Dumitru Enache, chief foreman at the Constanta Port Operations Enterprise and Workers Council member.

35. Elena Florea, Technical Quality Control technician, party committee secretary, Council of Workers president at the Pitesti Combine for Technical Articles of Rubber and RCP CC candidate member.

36. Maria Ionescu,director general at the Central Institute for Chemical Research, Bucharest, candidate member of the RCP CC, Grand National Assembly deputy and Hero of Socialist Labor.

37. Nicolae Iosif, director and first vice president of the Council of Workers at the Arad Train Car Enterprise and RCP CC member.

38. Iulica Ivan, miner, head of a brigade at the Horasti Mine, Motru mining enterprise, and Hero of Socialist Labor.

39. Elisabeta Kovacs, foreman's aid, party committee secretary, Council of Workers president at the Miercurea Ciuc Knitwear Enterprise, Harghita County, and RCP CC candidate member.

40. Gunther May, deputy director at the Mirsa Mechanical Enterprise, Sibiu County, and vice president of the Executive Committee of the General Union of Trade Unions.

41. Candid Man, head technician, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Iernut Thermoelectric Power Central, Mures.

42. Teodor Martos mechanic locksmith, party committee secretary, president of theCouncil of Workers at the 16 February Enterprise for Repair of Rolling Stock, Cluj-Napoca.

43. Gheorghe Matei, foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Tulcea Enterprise for Naval Construction and Technological Equipment.

44. Nicolae Macinic, foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Sebes Wood Processing Combine, Alba.

45. Ioan Marginean, foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Bistrita Household Glassware Enterprise.

46. Mihai Moraru, director at the Progress Heavy Equipment Enterprise, Braila, first vice president of the Council of Workers and RCP CC member.

47. Marin Nicolae, director and first vice president of the Council of Workers at the Iasi Construction Trust.

48. Ion Nicolaescu, foreman, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Rimnicu Vilcea Wood Processing Combine.

49. Petru Niculaica, foreman at the Dorna Foresta Timber Factory in the Suceava Enterprise for Forestry Exploitation and Transportation.

50. Alexandru Orzata, director, first vice president of the Council of Workers at the Slatina Aluminum Enterprise, Olt, and RCP CC candidate member.

51. Mihai Plesea, foreman, trade union committee president and president of the workers general meeting at the Videle ExtractionPlatform, Teleorman County.

52. Georgeta Podaru, foreman, party committee secretary, Council of Workers president at the Moldova Textile Enterprise, Botosani, and RCP CC member.

53. Constantin Popescu,technician at the Iron Gates Electric Power Enterprise, Mehedinti.

54. Gheorghe Popescu, president of the Investment Bank.

55. Ioan Salajan, mining foreman, head of a sector, party committee secretary and Council of Workers president at the Herja-Baia Mare Mining Operation, Maramures.

56. Zamfir Stancu, director, Council of Workers first vice president at the Borzesti Petrochemical Combine, Bacau, and RCP CC member.

57. Elena Tudoran, foreman, party committee secretary, Council of Workers president at the Focsani Cl thing Enterprise, Vrancea.

58. Gheorghe Turbureanu, chief foreman, party committee secretary for the section at the Resita Iron and Steel Combine and Her of Socialist Labor.

59. Corneliu Velincov, director, Council of Workers first vice president at the Calarasi Iron and Steel Combine and RCP CC member.

END OF FICHE

DATE FILMED

July 21 1981